



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,145	12/07/2004	Henrik Ryegard	43314-230021	6834
26694	7590	01/12/2009		
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			EXAMINER JEN, MINJEN	
			ART UNIT 3664	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/12/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,145

Applicant(s)

RYEGARD ET AL.

Examiner

IAN JEN

Art Unit

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 23, 24 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 23, 24 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/07/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is response to the communication filed on November 4th, 2008
2. Claims 15, 23, 24, 26-28 are pending in this action.
3. Claims 23, 26 - 28 have been amended.
4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15,23,24,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoddard et al (US Pat No 6697681) in view of Ikeda et al (US Pat No 6522949).

As per claim 15, Stoddard et al shows the control system wherein drive unit comprise one or more drives (Fig 1, Fig 2; Col 4, lines 10-67).

As per claim 23, Stoddard et al shows a control system for controlling the movements of at least two manipulators (Abstract, Fig 1 ; Col 1, lines 10 -46 where the manual motion of the robot is driven by electrical motor and computer program drive means), the control system comprising: a main computer module configured to execute programs with instructions for movements of the at least two manipulators (Fig 1, controller 56, 66, remote workstation 80 ; Col 3, lines 24-37; Col 4,lines 40- 30), the main computer module further comprising a power supply configured to supply power to the main computer module (Fig 1, Col 4, lines 10 - 33; Col 4, lines 40- 46); a drive module for each of the at least two manipulators (Col 2, lines 22 – 40; Col 3,lines 25 – Col 4,lines 35, Controller 30, Portable Operating Unit 10 for each manipulator), each drive module being physically separate from each other and from the main computer module each drive module comprising a drive unit that controls motors driving the movements of one of the manipulator to which the drive unit is operatively connected (Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25 - 50; Fig 2, Col 4, lines 10-50; Col 6, lines 15 - 50; Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25-34; Portable Operating Unit 10 for each manipulator), a casing surrounding the drive module (Fig 1, Col 2, lines 23 -41 where each robot has its own control handle with respect to individual functions along placed in different location), a power supply configured to supply power to the drive module and supply power to the manipulator to which the drive unit is operatively connected (Fig 1, Col 4, lines 10 - 33; Col 4, lines 40- 46, Col 3, lines 25-50), and an axis computer configured to provide control signals to the drive unit based on the orders received from the main computer module to control movement of the manipulator to which the drive unit is operatively connected (Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25 - 50 ; Col 3, lines 60 - Col.4, lines 30) and a communication network operatively connecting the main computer module is adapted to

communicate with the drive modules (Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25 - 50 ; Col 3, lines 60 - Col 4, lines 30).

Stoddard et al does not show to plan movement paths, and to generate orders based on the movement paths, the main computer module comprising a casing surrounding the main computer module.

Ikeda et al shows plan movement paths (Fig 5, Fig 6; Col 4, lines 60 - Col 5, lines 50), and to generate orders based on the movement paths (Fig 7, Fig 8; Col 6, lines 5 - Col 7, lines 35).

Each drive module being operatively connected to the main computer and to one of the at lease two manipulators.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide movement paths and orders based on movement paths as taught by Idea et al, to Stoddard et al, in order to provide a smooth running process while the industrial robot working under automated model.

As per claim 24, Stoddard et al shows the control system wherein the communication network comprises an Ethernet link (Col 3, lines 39-43; Col 4, lines 12 -15).

As per claim 28, Stoddard et al shows a method for controlling at least two at least two manipulators with a control system, the method comprising: transmitting with the main computer

module the orders for the at least two manipulators to at least two physically separate drive modules (Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25 - 50; Fig 2, Col 4, lines 10- 50; Col 6, lines 15 - 50; Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25-34); providing with an axis computer included in each of the at least two drive modules physically separate from each other and from the main computer module; control signals to the drive unit based-on the orders received from the main computer module (Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25 - 50; Fig 2, Col 4, lines 10-50; Col 6, lines 15 - 50; Fig 1, Col 3, lines 25- Col 4, lines 33); and driving and supplying power to motors of each of the at least two manipulators (Fig 1, Col 4, lines 10 - 33; Col 4, lines 40- 46) with a drive unit included in each of the at least two physically separate drive modules to drive the movements of the at least two manipulators (Fig 1, Col 2, lines 23 - 41; Col 4, lines 10-46; Col 3, lines 5 - Col 4, lines 5).

Ikeda et al shows plan movement paths (Fig 5, Fig 6; Col 4, lines 60 - Col 5, lines 50), and to generate orders based on the movement paths (Fig 7, Fig 8; Col 6, lines 5 - Col 7, lines 35), the main computer module comprising a casing surrounding the main computer module (Fig 1,150; Fig 2, 19 where the Computer module enclosed by casing).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide movement paths and orders based on movement paths as taught by Ikeda et al, to Stoddard et al, in order to provide a smooth running process while the industrial robot working under automated mode.

7. Claims 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoddard et al (US Pat No 6697681) and further in view of Ikeda et al (US Pat 6522949) and further in view of Matsumoto (US Pat No 6587749).

As per claim 26, Stoddard et al does not shows transformer module comprising a transformer.

Matsumoto shows transformer module comprising a transformer(Col 2, lines 55 - 63; Col 3, lines 39-45; Fig 1, where voltage transformer 4, terminal block 5, switch 6 are surrounded by casing). Ikeda et al shows a casing for power supply (Fig 2, 19).

The transformer module being physically separated from the main computer and drive module.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide power supply as taught by Matsumoto and Ikeda et al, respectively, to Stoddard et al, in order to provide a safety protection for the electrical safety in the industrial working environment.

As per claim 27, Stoddard et al shows a control module comprising a control panel of the control system (Col 3, lines 60 - Col 4, lines 30; Col 4, lines 50 - Col 5, lines 15), Stoddard et al does not show a power supply.

Ikeda et al shows casing surrounding the control module, and a power supply (Fig 2, 15, 19).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the casing for transformer module and power supply as taught by Matsumoto and Ikeda et al, respectively, to Stoddard et al, in order to provide a safety protection for the electrical safety in the industrial working environment.

The control module being physically separate from the main computer module and the drive module, the control module being operatively connected to the main computer module and drive modules.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15,23,24,28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
9. Applicant states in the Remark that Stoddard et al does not show a main computer to control multiple manipulators, and multiple drive modules. Stoddard et al mainly exhibit a few main controllers connect to multiple manipulator with respect to each manipulator possess a hand operation device and individual sub controller in network connection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Niedermayr (US Pat No 4611296) shows an industrial robot device.

Brantmark et al (US Pat No 4888708) shows a control system for industrial robot.

Tsuchihashi et al (US Pat No 5404290) shows an industrial robot manipulator.

Onoue et al (US Pat No 6218802) shows an industrial robot system.

Shimogama et al (US Pat No 6374156) shows a robot control system.

12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian Jen whose telephone number is 571-270-3274. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00-5:00 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 3664

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ian Jen/

Examiner, Art Unit 3664

/Dalena Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3664